## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 4-20, 24 and 25 are pending herein. Independent claim 1 and claims 2, 24 and 25 have been rewritten hereby, and claim 3 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully submit that support for the rewritten claims can be found in original claim 2, claim 3, paragraphs [0013], [0027] and [0031] of the original specification, for example, and that no new matter has been added.

1. The objection to the specification is noted, but deemed moot in view of the rewritten substitute specification paragraph submitted herewith. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the above objection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

2. Claims 1-20, 24 and 25 were rejected under §103(a) over Nakamura in view of WO '105 and JP '600. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is moot with respect to claim 3 in view of the cancellation thereof. To the extent that the PTO might attempt to assert this rejection against the rewritten claims submitted above, it is respectfully traversed.

Rewritten independent claim 1 includes the technical feature that the treatment for hydrophobitizing the fine particles is carried out by subjecting the fine particles to a graft treatment with a hydrophobilic polymer.

The present invention provides an antireflective laminate that has significantly improved water resistance, alkali resistance, and wetting resistance, and which also exhibits improved visibility and scratch resistance.

The hydrophobitized fine particles obtained by subjecting the fine particles to a graft treatment with the hydrophobilic polymer are used, for example, in Examples 2 and 4 of the present specification. Applicants respectfully submit that one skilled in the art would understand that the results of Examples 2 and 4 in Tables 1 and 2 in the present specification show that when the hydrophobitized fine particles obtained by subjecting fine particles to the graft treatment with the hydrophobilic polymer are used, the advantages of the present invention can be obtained.

Further, in the present invention, alkali resistance is needed for the antireflective laminate, because the antireflective laminate of the present invention is used in an image display surface of an image display device such as a liquid crystal display (LCD), and the antireflective laminate will need to be cleaned using a weakly alkaline liquid. Further, when the antireflective laminate of the present invention is used in an LCD, the light-transparent base material of the antireflective laminate has a function of protecting the PVA polarization element, and the light-transparent base material and PVA polarization element are laminated by an aqueous adhesive. The antireflective laminate is subjected to a saponification treatment using an alkaline liquid in order to improve adhesion between the light-transparent base material and PVA polarization element.

On the other hand, Nakamura simply discloses a low reflective index layer containing inorganic particles that may be subjected to a surface treatment by using a coupling agent. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Nakamura fails to disclose or suggest the use of hydrophobitized fine particles obtained by subjecting fine particles to a graft treatment with a hydrophobilic polymer, as claimed. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Nakamura fails to even recognize the technical problem of providing an antireflective laminate having alkali resistance, as in the case of the present invention.

WO '105 discloses a low refractive index layer containing inorganic particles such as silica fine particles, which may be subjected to a surface treatment using a coupling agent. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that WO '105 fails to disclose or suggest the use of hydrophobitized fine particles obtained by subjecting fine particles to a graft treatment with a hydrophobilic polymer, as claimed. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that WO '105 also fails to recognize the technical problem of providing an antireflective laminate having alkali resistance, as in the case of the present invention.

JP '600 discloses a coating formed of a low refractive index composition containing inorganic particles. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that JP '600 also fails to disclose or suggest the use of hydrophobitized fine particles obtained by subjecting fine particles to a graft treatment with a hydrophobilic polymer, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that JP '600 fails to recognize the technical problem of providing an antireflective laminate having alkali resistance.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature of rewritten independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, and all claims pending directly or indirectly therefrom, define patentable subject matter over the prior art of record, and respectfully request that the above rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

If the Examiner believes that contact with Applicants' attorney would be advantageous toward the disposition of this case, the Examiner is herein requested to call Applicants' attorney at the phone number noted below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1446.

Respectfully submitted,

May 16, 2011
Date

Stephen P. Burr
Reg. No. 32,970

Nicole J. Buckner
Reg. No. 51,508

SPB/NB/tlp

BURR & BROWN
P.O. Box 7068
Syracuse, NY 13261-7068

Customer No.: 025191
Telephone: (315) 233-8300
Facsimile: (315) 233-8320